

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Kenneth Evans, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | Civil Action No.: 4:11-cv-1663-TLW-SVH |
| |) | |
| Conseco Services, LLC, Washington |) | |
| National Insurance Company, and Pioneer |) | |
| Life Insurance Company of Illinois, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

ORDER

On July 8, 2011, this matter was removed to this Court based on the assertion of diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. (Doc. # 1). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. # 16). On September 26, 2011, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant the consent motion to remand (Doc. # 12). (Doc. # 16). No party filed objections to the Report. Objections were due on October 14, 2011.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this

Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 16). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the consent motion to remand this case to the Court of Common Pleas for Williamsburg County, South Carolina (Doc. # 12) is **GRANTED**. No costs are imposed because removal was not improper given the facts known to the defendants at the time of removal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

November 30, 2011
Florence, South Carolina